

RECEIVED

APR 21 2005

COMMENT TO DOCKET 03-123

Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

dianrez@yahoo.com wrote on 4/7/2005 9:11:30 AM

Hello,

I am a deaf person, wife to a deaf man, and mother of a deaf son and two hearing daughters. We have a Sorenson video phone and are limited to using just Sorenson video interpreters for our phone needs. In the near future we plan to get installation of another device to access the other video relay services This is because:

+++ we are tired of being restricted to one VRS service and having to
+++ wait long times for interpreting services. This is like being put
+++ on hold for up to fifteen minutes every time one makes a phone
call.

+++ we don't want to be restricted in case of emergency calls or urgent
+++ calls.

+++ we are limited by the settings on the device to accessing only
those
+++ devices made by the same company. We have many friends and
+++ relatives who use competitors' devices with different settings and
+++ webcams.

we don't really want to have two different devices (or three or four)
in our home and our workplace. This is like having several different
competing telephone services. This is ridiculous. But at this time,
necessary to have equivalent to full telephone service.

For these reasons, and because it is limiting to have one's telephone
access defined by one company, we want to have full interoperability of
all VRS services and devices, same as hearing people having full
interoperability of all phone devices no matter what service they
subscribe to.

Thanks,

Diane Plassey Gutierrez (also Edgar G. Gutierrez, Gavin E. Gutierrez)
52 Englewood Hill Pittsford, NY 14534

RECEIVED

APR 21 2005

COMMENT TO DOCKET 03-123

Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

Deafally@aol.com wrote on 3/22/2005 10:07:04 AM :

FIRST OF ALL, WE ARE THANKFUL TO BE ABLE TO HAVE ii2EYE AND SORENSON FOR VIDEO PHONE (VP) USE. IT'S REALLY A BLESSING.

WE WANT ACCESS TO BOTH ii2EYE AND SORENSON WHENEVER WE CALL THROUGH VP.

WE ARE FRUSTRATED THAT SORENSON HAS BLOCKED THE USE OF ii2EYE FOR SUCH A

LONG TIME. I WOULD LIKE SORENSON TO STOP DOING THIS.

HEARING PEOPLE ALWAYS HAVE THE LUXURY IN THEIR LIVES TO MAKE CHOICES AT THEIR CONVENIENCE WITH ACCESS ANYWHERE.

AS DEAF PEOPLE USING VIDEO PHONE, WE HAVE THE RIGHT TO ACCESS ANY PROVIDER.

PLEASE PUT AN END TO SORENSON'S UNFAIR PRACTICE OF BLOCKING OUR OPTIONS AND SERVICES.

PLEASE GIVE US BACK OUR RIGHTS FROM SORENSON'S CONTROL OF OUR RIGHTS AND CHOICES.

THIS IS ON OUR BEHALF AND THE CONSENSUS OF MANY OTHER DEAF USERS NATIONWIDE.

THANK YOU VERY MUCH.

JAMES L. BELDON, SR (PRESIDENT OF C.S.A.D IN SOUTH BEND, INDIANA)

RECEIVED

APR 21 2005

Comment to Docket 03-123

terp4asl@cox.net wrote on 3/22/2005 10:42:08 AM :
Tuesday, March 22, 2005

Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

The Honorable Federal Commission (FCC)
Dear Federal Commission (FCC),

The Americans with Disabilities Act mandates the FCC to ensure that deaf and hard of hearing persons have access to functionally equivalent telecommunications services, through Telecommunications Relay Services (TRS). One such form of TRS is Video Relay Service (VRS). VRS is an Internet based service which allows deaf, hard of hearing and speech disabled persons to make telephone calls in their natural visual language - American Sign Language (ASL) -- by use of a high speed data line and either a video phone or a personal computer equipped with a video camera.

VRS is more functionally equivalent to the telephone service available to hearing persons because it allows for language inflection and non-verbal cues that are impossible to achieve through traditional text-based TRS.

More importantly, VRS allows a conversation to proceed at its natural speed, while text-based TRS conversations can take several times as long. This often leads hearing persons, especially businesses, to refuse relay calls or to hang up upon receiving a call.

The FCC recognized VRS as a form of TRS as authorized by the ADA in 2000. However, recently, the FCC has shown what can at best be considered indifference to the service. Specifically, in June of 2003, the FCC cut the reimbursement rate for VRS upon 12 hours notice by more than 50 percent.

Prior to the rate cut, VRS was available 24 hours a day. Now it is not.

Prior to the rate cut, deaf and hard of hearing individuals were able to connect with an interpreter after a few seconds wait. Now wait time regularly exceeds a minute, sometimes as long as 20 minutes.

You would not tolerate such shabby service through voice telephony. Why should deaf and hard of hearing persons accept any less? Then in June of this year, the FCC cut the VRS payment rate again.

Officials at the FCC have attempted to blame the long wait times on the growing demand for VRS, not on its rate cuts. Perhaps that is a contributing factor, but it completely fails to explain why we no longer have 24 hours service available.

Moreover, the FCC has taken other recent steps that degrade VRS service. The FCC has ruled that VRS providers cannot provide ASL to Spanish translation on a VRS call. In addition, while the FCC requires that text-relay providers allow deaf persons to retrieve voice mail or messages from an answering machine, the FCC has yet to allow VRS providers to leave video voice mail messages for deaf persons. Thus, deaf and hard of hearing persons, as VRS users, have no way to receive a message via VRS which is functionally equivalent to the voice mail you can receive via your voice telephone service.

There are more than 28 million deaf and hard of hearing persons in the United States. While not all of us are fluent in American Sign Language and use VRS, the FCC's refusal to carry out its responsibilities under the ADA is unacceptable.

I am asking you to take action to ensure that the FCC to fulfill its responsibilities under the ADA to make functionally equivalent telecommunications service available to deaf, hard of hearing and speech disabled persons by adequately funding the service and authorizing Video mail service and ASL/Spanish translation. If the FCC refuses to do so, I am asking you to support legislation that would require the mandate of the ADA be fulfilled.

Sincerely,
Michael Bodak
10208 Waseca Ave
Las Vegas, NV 89144

RECEIVED

APR 21 2005

Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

Comment to Docket 03-123

-----Original Message-----

From: Afk444@aol.com [mailto:Afk444@aol.com]

Sent: Saturday, March 12, 2005 9:14 PM

To: Thomas Chandler

Cc: Afk444@aol.com

Subject: Need your support, D-Link and Sorrenson VP 100

To whom it may concern:

**I need your support to help out among deaf people about D-Link and Sorrenson VP100. My hopeful that you may understand how the deaf people want to communicate by video screen to interpreter to contact with professional people like: doctors, lawyers, businesses matters, etc.
Thank you**

**Amos Krinsky
afk444@aol.com**

RECEIVED

APR 21 2005

COMMENT TO DOCKET 03-123

Federal Communications Commission

teachbirth@yahoo.com wrote on 3/9/2005 7:43:12 PM : Office of the Secretary

March 9, 2005

Dear Sir or Madam;

I am concerning about Sorenson Company and telephone numbers. I feel it is not right for some people to use "old" telephone numbers, which it is "free" charge as unfair as hearing people and deaf people have telephone service, which they pay their telephone bills.

I learned when some deaf people "had" telephone service until they have the video phone (VP), and they stopped to use the telephone service any more. They keep using their "old" telephone numbers for friends, TTY/VP dictionary, church dictionary, doctors, businesses, who call them through VP or Sorenson Video Relay Service (VRS).

I feel that they advantage of old telephone number, which it is "free" charge except they can not call 911 emergency. Sorenson Video Relay can not call 911 from VP people.

What if police or business call "direct" that old telephone numbers without VP or VRS, and they will find out "wrong" number or "wrong" person. They can't find or they can't contact deaf people.

I have spoken with Sorenson Company, they knew about this, and there is "nothing" they can do.

I would like some deaf people to stop using "old" telephone numbers, when they don't have phone service.

Now, I am tired of Marketing businesses keep call me. I can't hear. How can I stop them?

Thank you for taking your time to understand this situation.

Sincerely,

Lisa Roush

teachbirth@yahoo.com

RECEIVED

COMMENT TO DOCKET 03-123

jedington@sorenson.com wrote on 3/10/2005 5:08:29 PM :

APR 21 2005

Dear FCC Staff,

Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

I have two good and bad comments about the SorensonVRS VP-100 that you had changed or will change the FCC rulings.

Good Comments:

The CSD Manager employee, Al Sonnenstrahl admitted that our Sorenson VP product and features are the best. He likes the VRS calls back system, toll free FASTVRS number for hearing customer to call to deaf customer, and missed calls. Al requested me to install the SorensonVRS VP unit at his home while he has i2eye VP unit.

Bad Comments:

You took the toll free FASTVRS call back feature away. Right now, my parents are hearing, and already furious with you for remove that system. I cannot image that in the past about three to four months that the public school, dentist, and doctors that my wife and I gave the toll free FASTVRS number to them. They will be upsetting and staying on the FASTVRS until the VRS is available. They can reject and not to bother to contact us anymore. This is very critical for the business to select the prompt for the VRS to call them back while they are busy with customers in doctor offices. I know they cannot hold on the phone to wait for VRS to answer the call while other customers to answer the call.

I know you are thinking about the VRS to call back to deaf and hard of hearing via VP to remove. I want to express this please do not remove the VRS call back. It is the same thing with the free FASTVRS call back for hearing customers that you already removed. We the Sorenson Company created the product and spent several million dollar on hardware and software to serve the best qualify communication access to the deaf and hard of hearing. Not only that, hearing customers already fell in love the VRS system. It is so fast and less communication than TTY, email, AIM, internet text message.

I have a question to ask you about this. Are you focus on deaf customers only or deaf customers and VRS business vendor? I mean that it looks like you are focus the deaf customers that complaint about our SorensonVRS product and you plan to take SorensonVRS idea and serve the best product to deaf community away?

We the Sorenson Company has been working so hard to setup the VRS call centers and hiring high qualify certificate VRS interpreters. Not only that, we the Sorenson team has to respect the interpreters if they need a short break to prevent getting CTS on their wrists, and arms. I know we are working and processing to get this better. I want you to remember that the VRS system is very young and new.

I hope this comments and remarks to understand you why this is so critical that we serve to deaf community with our best product.

Thank you very much for listen this.

John Edington
Outreach Manager
SorensonMedia, Inc

COMMENT TO DOCKET 03-123

RECEIVED

-----Original Message-----

From: Tim Johnston [mailto:tsjohnston@comcast.net]

Sent: Wednesday, March 02, 2005 1:25 PM

To: FCCINFO

Cc: Thomas Chandler; Jenifer Simpson

Subject: Can't reach other VRS

APR 21 2005

Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

To Whom It May Concern:

I am stunned to discover that my Sorenson VP-100 does indeed PREVENT my attempt to dial another VRS service like CACVRS.TV (Communication Access Center VRS) with a message something like "Only Sorenson VRS can be used with this Sorenson VP-100 Videophone."

One or two weeks ago, I was able to reach CACVRS.TV with no problem but the blocking message showed up last Feb 28th and also yesterday, Mar 1st.

I am very surprised since the FCC regulations on VRS made it clear about the use of "Interoperability" on any videophone equipments.

So please seriously consider in taking the appropriate action about Sorenson *for putting in a* blocking message.

Sincerely yours,
Tim Johnston
Concerned VRS user

RECEIVED

APR 21 2005

Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

COMMENT TO DOCKET 03-123

Tommy.R.Walker@mail.sprint.com wrote on 4/6/2005 11:13:28 AM :

Sirs:

Interoperability of the video equipment is a critical and necessary function that should be mandatory of all equipment in public hands. In the event of a system-wide crash of one vendor, thousands of individuals could be locked out of telephone communications-all which could be averted by mandatory interoperability requirements. Most users do not fully realize when they accept video equipment that their hands will be tied permanently-it's unfair and even ridiculous.

Please mandate interoperability of ALL video and TTY equipment.

Thank you.

Tommy Walker

* 501-217-0051 TTY

* 501-954-1810 Fax

* 501-312-4960 Voice

* tommy.r.walker@mail.sprint.com

[<mailto:carol.h.kenny@mail.sprint.com>](mailto:carol.h.kenny@mail.sprint.com)

RECEIVED

APR 21 2005

Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

COMMENT TO DOCKET 03-123

d.miller@sio.midco.net wrote on 4/12/2005 11:26:59 PM :

I feel we should not allow VRS providers to prevent their consumers from using another VRS provider. If I am a customer of Quest phone service, sometimes I can ask to use MCI or another long distance provider who has better fees or service. Why allow the VRS provider (who receives federal funds) to further their own interests, instead of the consumer's?

People should have the right to choose their own service provider, regardless of the type of the "phone" they received. I don't want all VRS providers to end up restricting access to their own VRS services. I will end up having 3-4 different types of "phones" - just in case the wait is long with one VRS provider. I would have to turn off one "videophone", turn the other one on, go get the "Y" cable, put it in the back of the TV or the unit, etc etc etc., I don't even know what else. I'm not tech savvy and it would be a huge frustration. What if I can't make an important call to the police station because I can't figure out how to get the right equipment hooked up!

Please - let's simplify the process for the deaf consumer (who is really the consumer here).

Tanya Miller
5209 E. Belmont St.
Sioux Falls, SD 57110

RECEIVED

APR 21 2005

COMMENT TO DOCKET 03-123

mehdighafoorian@yahoo.com wrote on 4/16/2005 1:22:07 PM :

April 16, 2005

Federal Commission (FCC)

Dear Federal Commission (FCC),

The Americans with Disabilities Act mandates the FCC to ensure that deaf and hard of hearing persons have access to functionally equivalent telecommunications services, through Telecommunications Relay Services (TRS). One such form of TRS is Video Relay Service (VRS).

VRS is an Internet based service which allows deaf, hard of hearing and speech disabled persons to make telephone calls in their natural visual language - American Sign Language (ASL) -- by use of a high speed data line and either a video phone or a personal computer equipped with a video camera.

VRS is more functionally equivalent to the telephone service available to hearing persons because it allows for language inflection and non-verbal cues that are impossible to achieve through traditional text-based TRS.

More importantly, VRS allows a conversation to proceed at its natural speed, while text-based TRS conversations can take several times as long. This often leads hearing persons, especially businesses, to refuse relay calls or to hang up upon receiving a call.

The FCC recognized VRS as a form of TRS as authorized by the ADA in 2000. However, recently, the FCC has shown what can at best be considered indifference to the service. Specifically, in June of 2003, the FCC cut the reimbursement rate for VRS upon 12 hours notice by more than 50 percent.

Prior to the rate cut, VRS was available 24 hours a day. Now it is not.

Prior to the rate cut, deaf and hard of hearing individuals were able to connect with an interpreter after a few seconds wait. Now wait time regularly exceeds a minute, sometimes as long as 20 minutes.

You would not tolerate such shabby service through voice telephony. Why should deaf and hard of hearing persons accept any less? Then in June of this year, the FCC cut the VRS payment rate again.

Officials at the FCC have attempted to blame the long wait times on the growing demand for VRS, not on its rate cuts. Perhaps that is a contributing factor, but it completely fails to explain why we no longer have 24 hours service available. Moreover, the FCC has taken other recent steps that degrade VRS service. The FCC has ruled that VRS providers cannot provide ASL to Spanish translation on a VRS call. In addition, while the FCC requires that text-relay providers allow deaf persons to retrieve voice mail or messages from an answering machine, the FCC has yet to allow VRS providers to leave video voice mail messages for deaf persons. Thus, deaf and hard of hearing persons, as VRS users, have no way to receive a message via VRS which is functionally equivalent to the voice mail you can receive via your voice telephone service.

There are more than 28 million deaf and hard of hearing persons in the United States. While not all of us are fluent in American Sign Language and use VRS, the FCC's refusal to carry out its responsibilities under the ADA is unacceptable. I am asking you to take action to ensure that the FCC to fulfill its responsibilities under the ADA to make functionally equivalent telecommunications service available to deaf, hard of hearing and speech disabled persons by adequately funding the service and authorizing Video mail service and ASL/Spanish translation. If the FCC refuses to do so, I am asking you to support legislation that would require the mandate of the ADA be fulfilled.

Sincerely,

mehdi ghafoorian

no16,6th jamaladin assad abadi Ave,tehran IRAN

Tehran, MD 0098+021

Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

RECEIVED

APR 21 2005

Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

COMMENT TO DOCKET 03-123

toll1@towson.edu wrote on 3/4/2005 2:22:06 PM :

Friday, March 04, 2005

The Honorable Federal Commission (FCC)

Dear Federal Commission (FCC),

The Americans with Disabilities Act mandates the FCC to ensure that deaf and hard of hearing persons have access to functionally equivalent telecommunications services, through Telecommunications Relay Services (TRS). One such form of TRS is Video Relay Service (VRS).

VRS is an Internet based service which allows deaf, hard of hearing and speech disabled persons to make telephone calls in their natural visual language - American Sign Language (ASL) -- by use of a high speed data line and either a video phone or a personal computer equipped with a video camera.

VRS is more functionally equivalent to the telephone service available to hearing persons because it allows for language inflection and non-verbal cues that are impossible to achieve through traditional text-based TRS.

More importantly, VRS allows a conversation to proceed at its natural speed, while text-based TRS conversations can take several times as long. This often leads hearing persons, especially businesses, to refuse relay calls or to hang up upon receiving a call.

The FCC recognized VRS as a form of TRS as authorized by the ADA in 2000. However, recently, the FCC has shown what can at best be considered indifference to the service. Specifically, in June of 2003, the FCC cut the reimbursement rate for VRS upon 12 hours notice by more than 50 percent.

Prior to the rate cut, VRS was available 24 hours a day. Now it is not.

Prior to the rate cut, deaf and hard of hearing individuals were able to connect with an interpreter after a few seconds wait. Now wait time regularly exceeds a minute, sometimes as long as 20 minutes.

You would not tolerate such shabby service through voice telephony. Why should deaf and hard of hearing persons accept any less? Then in June of this year, the FCC cut the VRS payment rate again.

Officials at the FCC have attempted to blame the long wait times on the growing demand for VRS, not on its rate cuts. Perhaps that is a contributing factor, but it completely fails to explain why we no longer have 24 hours service available. Moreover, the FCC has taken other recent steps that degrade VRS service. The FCC has ruled that VRS providers cannot provide ASL to Spanish translation on a VRS call. In addition, while the FCC requires that text-relay providers allow deaf persons to retrieve voice mail or messages from an answering machine, the FCC has yet to allow VRS providers to leave video voice mail messages for deaf persons. Thus, deaf and hard of hearing persons, as VRS users, have no way to receive a message via VRS which is functionally equivalent to the voice mail you can receive via your voice telephone service.

There are more than 28 million deaf and hard of hearing persons in the United States. While not all of us are fluent in American Sign Language and use VRS, the FCC's refusal to carry out its responsibilities under the ADA is unacceptable. I am asking you to take action to ensure that the FCC to fulfill its responsibilities under the ADA to make functionally equivalent telecommunications service available to deaf, hard of hearing and speech disabled persons by adequately funding the service and authorizing Video mail service and ASL/Spanish translation. If the FCC refuses to do so, I am asking you to support legislation that would require the mandate of the ADA be fulfilled.

Sincerely,

Laura Toll

5309 Wendley Rd

Baltimore, MD 21229

COMMENT TO DOCKET 03-123
KLKOCISIS@AOL.COM wrote on 3/7/2005 6:12:06 PM :

Monday, March 07, 2005

The Honorable Federal Commission (FCC)

RECEIVED

APR 21 2005

Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

Dear Federal Commission (FCC),

The Americans with Disabilities Act mandates the FCC to ensure that deaf and hard of hearing persons have access to functionally equivalent telecommunications services, through Telecommunications Relay Services (TRS). One such form of TRS is Video Relay Service (VRS).

VRS is an Internet based service which allows deaf, hard of hearing and speech disabled persons to make telephone calls in their natural visual language - American Sign Language (ASL) -- by use of a high speed data line and either a video phone or a personal computer equipped with a video camera.

VRS is more functionally equivalent to the telephone service available to hearing persons because it allows for language inflection and non-verbal cues that are impossible to achieve through traditional text-based TRS.

More importantly, VRS allows a conversation to proceed at its natural speed, while text-based TRS conversations can take several times as long. This often leads hearing persons, especially businesses, to refuse relay calls or to hang up upon receiving a call.

The FCC recognized VRS as a form of TRS as authorized by the ADA in 2000. However, recently, the FCC has shown what can at best be considered indifference to the service. Specifically, in June of 2003, the FCC cut the reimbursement rate for VRS upon 12 hours notice by more than 50 percent.

Prior to the rate cut, VRS was available 24 hours a day. Now it is not.

Prior to the rate cut, deaf and hard of hearing individuals were able to connect with an interpreter after a few seconds wait. Now wait time regularly exceeds a minute, sometimes as long as 20 minutes.

You would not tolerate such shabby service through voice telephony. Why should deaf and hard of hearing persons accept any less? Then in June of this year, the FCC cut the VRS payment rate again.

Officials at the FCC have attempted to blame the long wait times on the growing demand for VRS, not on its rate cuts. Perhaps that is a contributing factor, but it completely fails to explain why we no longer have 24 hours service available.

Moreover, the FCC has taken other recent steps that degrade VRS service. The FCC has ruled that VRS providers cannot provide ASL to Spanish translation on a VRS call. In addition, while the FCC requires that text-relay providers allow deaf persons to retrieve voice mail or messages from an answering machine, the FCC has yet to allow VRS providers to leave video voice mail messages for deaf persons. Thus, deaf and hard of hearing persons, as VRS users, have no way to receive a message via VRS which is functionally equivalent to the voice mail you can receive via your voice telephone service.

There are more than 28 million deaf and hard of hearing persons in the United States. While not all of us are fluent in American Sign Language and use VRS, the FCC's refusal to carry out its responsibilities under the ADA is unacceptable.

I am asking you to take action to ensure that the FCC to fulfill its responsibilities under the ADA to make functionally equivalent telecommunications service available to deaf, hard of hearing and speech disabled persons by adequately funding the service and authorizing Video mail service and ASL/Spanish translation. If the FCC refuses to do so, I am asking you to support legislation that would require the mandate of the ADA be fulfilled.

Sincerely,

LINDA KOCSIS
4640 S Wilt Ave
Las Cruces, NM 88011

COMMENT TO DOCKET 03-123

Baron1981@comcast.net wrote on 3/28/2005 9:12:22 AM :

RECEIVED

Monday, March 28, 2005

APR 21 2005

The Honorable Federal Commission (FCC)

**Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary**

Dear Federal Commission (FCC),

The Americans with Disabilities Act mandates the FCC to ensure that deaf and hard of hearing persons have access to functionally equivalent telecommunications services, through Telecommunications Relay Services (TRS). One such form of TRS is Video Relay Service (VRS).

VRS is an Internet based service which allows deaf, hard of hearing and speech disabled persons to make telephone calls in their natural visual language - American Sign Language (ASL) -- by use of a high speed data line and either a video phone or a personal computer equipped with a video camera.

VRS is more functionally equivalent to the telephone service available to hearing persons because it allows for language inflection and non-verbal cues that are impossible to achieve through traditional text-based TRS.

More importantly, VRS allows a conversation to proceed at its natural speed, while text-based TRS conversations can take several times as long. This often leads hearing persons, especially businesses, to refuse relay calls or to hang up upon receiving a call.

The FCC recognized VRS as a form of TRS as authorized by the ADA in 2000. However, recently, the FCC has shown what can at best be considered indifference to the service. Specifically, in June of 2003, the FCC cut the reimbursement rate for VRS upon 12 hours notice by more than 50 percent.

Prior to the rate cut, VRS was available 24 hours a day. Now it is not.

Prior to the rate cut, deaf and hard of hearing individuals were able to connect with an interpreter after a few seconds wait. Now wait time regularly exceeds a minute, sometimes as long as 20 minutes.

You would not tolerate such shabby service through voice telephony. Why should deaf and hard of hearing persons accept any less? Then in June of this year, the FCC cut the VRS payment rate again.

Officials at the FCC have attempted to blame the long wait times on the growing demand for VRS, not on its rate cuts. Perhaps that is a contributing factor, but it completely fails to explain why we no longer have 24 hours service available.

Moreover, the FCC has taken other recent steps that degrade VRS service. The FCC has ruled that VRS providers cannot provide ASL to Spanish translation on a VRS call. In addition, while the FCC requires that text-relay providers allow deaf persons to retrieve voice mail or messages from an answering machine, the FCC has yet to allow VRS providers to leave video voice mail messages for deaf persons. Thus, deaf and hard of hearing persons, as VRS users, have no way to receive a message via VRS which is functionally equivalent to the voice mail you can receive via your voice telephone service.

There are more than 28 million deaf and hard of hearing persons in the United States. While not all of us are fluent in American Sign Language and use VRS, the FCC's refusal to carry out its responsibilities under the ADA is unacceptable.

I am asking you to take action to ensure that the FCC to fulfill its responsibilities under the ADA to make functionally equivalent telecommunications service available to deaf, hard of hearing and speech disabled persons by adequately funding the service and authorizing Video mail service and ASL/Spanish translation. If the FCC refuses to do so, I am asking you to support legislation that would require the mandate of the ADA be fulfilled.

Sincerely,

Brenda Aron
418 Wildwood Gln
Stone Mountain, GA 30083

RECEIVED

COMMENT TO DOCKET 03-123

JEBoard@aol.com wrote on 3/28/2005 4:12:08 PM :

APR 21 2005

Monday, March 28, 2005

Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

The Honorable Federal Commission (FCC)

Dear Federal Commission (FCC),

The Americans with Disabilities Act mandates the FCC to ensure that deaf and hard of hearing persons have access to functionally equivalent telecommunications services, through Telecommunications Relay Services (TRS). One such form of TRS is Video Relay Service (VRS).

VRS is an Internet based service which allows deaf, hard of hearing and speech disabled persons to make telephone calls in their natural visual language - American Sign Language (ASL) -- by use of a high speed data line and either a video phone or a personal computer equipped with a video camera.

VRS is more functionally equivalent to the telephone service available to hearing persons because it allows for language inflection and non-verbal cues that are impossible to achieve through traditional text-based TRS.

More importantly, VRS allows a conversation to proceed at its natural speed, while text-based TRS conversations can take several times as long. This often leads hearing persons, especially businesses, to refuse relay calls or to hang up upon receiving a call.

The FCC recognized VRS as a form of TRS as authorized by the ADA in 2000. However, recently, the FCC has shown what can at best be considered indifference to the service. Specifically, in June of 2003, the FCC cut the reimbursement rate for VRS upon 12 hours notice by more than 50 percent.

Prior to the rate cut, VRS was available 24 hours a day. Now it is not.

Prior to the rate cut, deaf and hard of hearing individuals were able to connect with an interpreter after a few seconds wait. Now wait time regularly exceeds a minute, sometimes as long as 20 minutes.

You would not tolerate such shabby service through voice telephony. Why should deaf and hard of hearing persons accept any less? Then in June of this year, the FCC cut the VRS payment rate again.

Officials at the FCC have attempted to blame the long wait times on the growing demand for VRS, not on its rate cuts. Perhaps that is a contributing factor, but it completely fails to explain why we no longer have 24 hours service available.

Moreover, the FCC has taken other recent steps that degrade VRS service. The FCC has ruled that VRS providers cannot provide ASL to Spanish translation on a VRS call. In addition, while the FCC requires that text-relay providers allow deaf persons to retrieve voice mail or messages from an answering machine, the FCC has yet to allow VRS providers to leave video voice mail messages for deaf persons. Thus, deaf and hard of hearing persons, as VRS users, have no way to receive a message via VRS which is functionally equivalent to the voice mail you can receive via your voice telephone service.

There are more than 28 million deaf and hard of hearing persons in the United States. While not all of us are fluent in American Sign Language and use VRS, the FCC's refusal to carry out its responsibilities under the ADA is unacceptable.

I am asking you to take action to ensure that the FCC to fulfill its responsibilities under the ADA to make functionally equivalent telecommunications service available to deaf, hard of hearing and speech disabled persons by adequately funding the service and authorizing Video mail service and ASL/Spanish translation. If the FCC refuses to do so, I am asking you to support legislation that would require the mandate of the ADA be fulfilled.

Sincerely,

James Boardman
20 Old Grange Rd
Hopewell Junction, NY 12533

RECEIVED

APR 21 2005

Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

gutz1826@uslink.net wrote on 4/3/2005 1:12:13 PM :

Sunday, April 03, 2005

The Honorable Federal Commission (FCC)
Dear Federal Commission (FCC),

The Americans with Disabilities Act mandates the FCC to ensure that deaf and hard of hearing persons have access to functionally equivalent telecommunications services, through Telecommunications Relay Services (TRS). One such form of TRS is Video Relay Service (VRS).

VRS is an Internet based service which allows deaf, hard of hearing and speech disabled persons to make telephone calls in their natural visual language - American Sign Language (ASL) -- by use of a high speed data line and either a video phone or a personal computer equipped with a video camera.

VRS is more functionally equivalent to the telephone service available to hearing persons because it allows for language inflection and non-verbal cues that are impossible to achieve through traditional text-based TRS.

More importantly, VRS allows a conversation to proceed at its natural speed, while text-based TRS conversations can take several times as long. This often leads hearing persons, especially businesses, to refuse relay calls or to hang up upon receiving a call.

The FCC recognized VRS as a form of TRS as authorized by the ADA in 2000. However, recently, the FCC has shown what can at best be considered indifference to the service. Specifically, in June of 2003, the FCC cut the reimbursement rate for VRS upon 12 hours notice by more than 50 percent.

Prior to the rate cut, VRS was available 24 hours a day. Now it is not.

Prior to the rate cut, deaf and hard of hearing individuals were able to connect with an interpreter after a few seconds wait. Now wait time regularly exceeds a minute, sometimes as long as 20 minutes.

You would not tolerate such shabby service through voice telephony. Why should deaf and hard of hearing persons accept any less? Then in June of this year, the FCC cut the VRS payment rate again.

Officials at the FCC have attempted to blame the long wait times on the growing demand for VRS, not on its rate cuts. Perhaps that is a contributing factor, but it completely fails to explain why we no longer have 24 hours service available.

Moreover, the FCC has taken other recent steps that degrade VRS service. The FCC has ruled that VRS providers cannot provide ASL to Spanish translation on a VRS call. In addition, while the FCC requires that text-relay providers allow deaf persons to retrieve voice mail or messages from an answering machine, the FCC has yet to allow VRS providers to leave video voice mail messages for deaf persons. Thus, deaf and hard of hearing persons, as VRS users, have no way to receive a message via VRS which is functionally equivalent to the voice mail you can receive via your voice telephone service.

There are more than 28 million deaf and hard of hearing persons in the United States. While not all of us are fluent in American Sign Language and use VRS, the FCC's refusal to carry out its responsibilities under the ADA is unacceptable.

I am asking you to take action to ensure that the FCC to fulfill its responsibilities under the ADA to make functionally equivalent telecommunications service available to deaf, hard of hearing and speech disabled persons by adequately funding the service and authorizing Video mail service and ASL/Spanish translation. If the FCC refuses to do so, I am asking you to support legislation that would require the mandate of the ADA be fulfilled.

Sincerely, JoAnn Gutz 18268 US Highway 169 Grand Rapids, MN 55744